

REMARKS

By this Amendment the specification has been amended to better describe the invention and to otherwise better comply with U.S. practice, claim 1 has been replaced by new claim 18 which better defines the invention, claims 2-15 have been amended as appropriate, and claim 17 has been amended to use corresponding language to that used in new claim 18. Entry is requested.

The applicants are herewith submitting a supplemental page 10 for this application containing a proper abstract of the disclosure.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rowe, he has rejected claims 1, 5-8, 11, 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Belik, he has rejected claims 1-8, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiuchi et al. in view of Miyake et al., he has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Grondahl, and he has rejected claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belik in view of Larsson et al.

These rejections cannot apply to the amended claims.

Rowe discloses a fluid responsive rotor generator wherein blades 26 are connected to a centrally located rotor 22. The blades are not axially offset from the rotor.

Similarly, in Belik the rotor 5 is radially within the turbine vanes 8.

Similarly, in Horiuchi et al. the vanes 64 are not part of a turbine which is axially offset from a rotor of an electrical generator.

Nothing in Miyake et al., Grondahl or Larsson et al. would overcome the basic deficiencies in Rowe, Belik and Horiuchi et al.

The examiner's rejections should be withdrawn and the amended claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:



Richard H. Tushin
Registration No. 27,297
Franklin Square, Third Floor West
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3353
(202) 906-8680